arXiv:1611.04530v1 [math.DG] 14 Nov 2016

# A CLASSIFICATION OF TOTALLY GEODESIC AND TOTALLY UMBILICAL LEGENDRIAN SUBMANIFOLDS OF $(\kappa,\mu)$-SPACES

ALFONSO CARRIAZO, VERÓNICA MARTÍN-MOLINA, AND LUC VRANCKEN

Abstract. We present classifications of totally geodesic and totally umbilical Legendrian submanifolds of $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces with Boeckx invariant $I \leq -1$. In particular, we prove that such submanifolds must be, up to local isometries, among the examples that we explicitly construct.

## 1. Introduction

Although under a different name, $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces were introduced by D. E. Blair, T. Koufogiorgos and B. J. Papantoniou in [2] (for technical details, we refer to the Preliminaries section). Actually, these manifolds have proven to be really useful, because they provide non-trivial examples for some important classes of contact metric manifolds (for instance, the unit tangent sphere bundle of any Riemannian manifold of constant sectional curvature carries such a structure). The theory of $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces was soon developed, with many interesting results. In particular, we can point out the outstanding paper [3], where E. Boeckx classified non-Sasakian $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces by using the invariant $I$ (depending only on the values of $\kappa$ and $\mu$) introduced by himself. He also provided examples for all possible $(\kappa,\mu)$.

Nevertheless, the theory of submanifolds of $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces has not been developed in depth yet, even if we can find some very interesting papers about it. For example, in [4], B. Cappelletti Montano, L. Di Terlizzi and M. M. Tripathi proved that any invariant submanifold of a non-Sasakian contact $(\kappa,\mu)$-space is always totally geodesic and, conversely, that every totally geodesic submanifold of a non-Sasakian contact $(\kappa,\mu)$-space such that $\mu \neq 0$ and the characteristic vector field $\xi$ is tangent to the submanifold is invariant. Motivated by these results, we consider the case of submanifolds which are normal to $\xi$. Moreover, we restrict our study to the case of Legendrian submanifolds, i.e., those with dimension $n$ in a $(2n+1)$-dimensional ambient space.

¿From our point of view, a key step in continuing the analysis of submanifolds of $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces should be to understand the behavior of the so-called $h$ operator of the ambient space with respect to the submanifold. Therefore, in this paper, we first establish in Section 3 a decomposition of that operator in its tangent and normal parts, and find its main properties. In Section 4 we present several examples of totally geodesic and totally umbilical Legendrian submanifolds of $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces with $I \leq -1$. Actually, we prove in Section 5 that these examples

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C15, 53C25, 53C40.

*Key words and phrases.* $(\kappa,\mu)$-space, Legendrian submanifold, totally geodesic, totally umbilical.

The first two authors are partially supported by the MINECO-FEDER grant MTM2014-52197-P. They are members of the IMUS (Instituto de Matemáticas de la Universidad de Sevilla), and of the PAIDI groups FQM-327 and FQM-226 (Junta de Andalucía, Spain), respectively.

constitute the complete local classification of these kinds of submanifolds, given by our main results Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let $M$ be a $(2n+1)$-dimensional smooth manifold $M$. Then an *almost contact structure* is a triplet $(\varphi, \xi, \eta)$, where $\varphi$ is a $(1,1)$-tensor field, $\eta$ a 1-form and $\xi$ a vector field on $M$ satisfying the following conditions

$$\varphi^2 = -I + \eta \otimes \xi, \ \eta(\xi) = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

It follows from (2.1) that $\varphi\xi = 0$, $\eta \circ \varphi = 0$ and that $\operatorname{rank}(\varphi) = 2n$ ([1]).

Any almost contact manifold $(M, \varphi, \xi, \eta)$ admits a *compatible metric*, i.e. a Riemannian metric $g$ satisfying

$$g(\varphi X, \varphi Y) = g(X, Y) - \eta(X)\,\eta(Y),$$

for all vector fields $X, Y$ on $M$. It follows that $\eta = g(\cdot, \xi)$ and $g(\cdot, \varphi\cdot) = -g(\varphi\cdot, \cdot)$. The manifold $M$ is said to be an *almost contact metric manifold* with structure $(\varphi, \xi, \eta, g)$.

We can define the *fundamental 2-form* $\Phi$ of an almost contact metric manifold by $\Phi(X, Y) = g(X, \varphi Y)$. If $\Phi = d\eta$, then $\eta$ becomes a contact form, with $\xi$ its Reeb/characteristic vector field and $\mathcal{D} = \ker(\eta)$ its corresponding contact distribution, and $M(\varphi, \xi, \eta, g)$ is called a *contact metric manifold*.

Every contact metric manifold satisfies

$$\nabla\xi = -\varphi - \varphi h, \tag{2.2}$$

where $2h$ is the Lie derivative of $\varphi$ in the direction of $\xi$, i.e. $h = \frac{1}{2} L_\xi \varphi$. The tensor field $h$ is symmetric with respect to $g$, satisfies $h\xi = 0$, anticommutes with $\varphi$ and vanishes identically if and only if the Reeb vector field $\xi$ is Killing. In this last case the contact metric manifold is said to be *$K$-contact*.

An almost contact metric manifold is said to be *normal* if $N_\varphi := [\varphi, \varphi] + 2d\eta \otimes \xi = 0$. A normal contact metric manifold is called a *Sasakian manifold*. Any Sasakian manifold is K-contact and the converse holds in dimension 3 but not in general.

A special class of contact metric manifold is that of $(\kappa, \mu)$-spaces, first studied in [2] under the name of *contact metric manifolds with $\xi$ belonging to the $(\kappa, \mu)$-distribution*. A *contact metric $(\kappa, \mu)$-space* is one satisfying the condition

$$R(X, Y)\xi = \kappa\,(\eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y) + \mu\,(\eta(Y)hX - \eta(X)hY), \tag{2.3}$$

for some constants $\kappa$ and $\mu$. In this paper, all manifolds will be contact metric, so we will shorten "contact metric $(\kappa, \mu)$-space" to "$(\kappa, \mu)$-space".

Every $(\kappa, \mu)$-space satisfies

$$h^2 = (\kappa - 1)\varphi^2, \tag{2.4}$$

$$(\nabla_X \varphi)Y = g(X, Y + hY)\xi - \eta(Y)(X + hX), \tag{2.5}$$

$$(\nabla_X h)Y = ((1-\kappa)g(X, \varphi Y) - g(X, \varphi hY))\xi - \eta(Y)((1-\kappa)\varphi X + \varphi hX) - \mu\eta(X)\varphi hY. \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, we have the following result:

**Theorem 2.1** ([2]). *Let $M^{2n+1}(\varphi,\xi,\eta,g)$ be a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space. Then $\kappa\leq 1$. If $\kappa=1$, then $h=0$ and $M^{2n+1}$ is a Sasakian manifold. If $\kappa<1$, $M^{2n+1}$ admits three mutually orthogonal and integrable distributions $E(0)=span(\xi)$, $E(\lambda)$ and $E(-\lambda)$ determined by the eigenspaces of $h$, where $\lambda=\sqrt{1-\kappa}$.*

As a consequence of this theorem, it was also proved in [2] that the sectional curvature of a plane section $\{X,Y\}$ normal to $\xi$ is given by

$$K(X,Y)=\begin{cases}2(1+\lambda)-\mu, \text{ for any } X,Y\in E(\lambda), \quad n>1,\\ 2(1-\lambda)-\mu, \text{ for any } X,Y\in E(-\lambda), \quad n>1,\\ -(\kappa+\mu)(g(X,\varphi Y))^2, \text{ for any unit vectors } X\in E(\lambda), Y\in E(-\lambda).\end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

Given a contact metric manifold $M^{2n+1}(\varphi,\xi,\eta,g)$, a *$D_a$-homothetic deformation* is a change of structure tensors of the form

$$\tilde{\varphi}=\frac{1}{a}\varphi,\ \tilde{\xi}=\xi,\ \tilde{\eta}=a\eta,\ \tilde{g}=ag+a(a-1)\eta\otimes\eta, \tag{2.8}$$

where $a$ is a positive constant. It is well known that $M^{2n+1}(\tilde{\varphi},\tilde{\xi},\tilde{\eta},\tilde{g})$ is also a contact metric manifold.

It was also proved in [2] that the class of $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces remains invariant under $D_a$-homothetic deformations. Indeed, applying one of these deformations to a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space yields a new $(\tilde{\kappa},\tilde{\mu})$-space, where

$$\tilde{\kappa}=\frac{\kappa+a^2-1}{a^2},\ \tilde{\mu}=\frac{\mu+2a-2}{a}.$$

Many authors studied $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces later, as can be seen in [1]. We highlight here the work of Boeckx, who gave in [3] an explicit writing of the curvature tensor of these spaces:

$$\begin{aligned}R(X,Y)Z=&\left(1-\frac{\mu}{2}\right)(g(Y,Z)X-g(X,Z)Y)\\&+g(Y,Z)hX-g(X,Z)hY-g(hX,Z)Y+g(hY,Z)X\\&+\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}(g(hY,Z)hX-g(hX,Z)hY)\\&-\frac{\mu}{2}(g(\varphi Y,Z)\varphi X-g(\varphi X,Z)\varphi Y)\\&+\frac{\kappa-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}(g(\varphi hY,Z)\varphi hX-g(\varphi hX,Z)\varphi hY)\\&-\eta(X)\eta(Z)\left(\left(\kappa-1+\frac{\mu}{2}\right)Y+(\mu-1)hY\right)\\&-\eta(Y)\eta(Z)\left(\left(\kappa-1+\frac{\mu}{2}\right)X+(\mu-1)hX\right)\\&-\eta(Y)\left(\left(\kappa-1+\frac{\mu}{2}\right)g(X,Z)+(\mu-1)g(hX,Z)\right)\xi.\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Boeckx [3] also classified the $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces in terms of an invariant that he introduced: $I_M=\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{\sqrt{1-\kappa}}$. Indeed, he proved that if $M_1$ and $M_2$ are two non-Sasakian $(\kappa_i,\mu_i)$-spaces of the same dimension, then $I_{M_1}=I_{M_2}$ if and only if, up to a $D_a$-homothetic deformation, the two spaces are locally isometric as contact metric spaces. In particular, if both spaces are simply connected and complete, they are globally isometric up to a $D_a$-homothetic deformation.

It was also stated in paper [3] that "it follows that we know all non-Sasakian $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces locally as soon as we have, for every odd dimension $2n+1$ and for every possible value for the invariant $I$, one $(\kappa,\mu)$-space $M$ with $I_M = I$." For $I > -1$, we have the unit tangent sphere bundle $T_1M^n(c)$ of a space of constant curvature $c$ ($c \neq 1$) for the appropriate $c$ (see [2]). For $I \leq -1$, Boeckx presented in [3] the following examples for any possible odd dimension $2n+1$ and value of $I$.

*Example* 2.2 ([3]). Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a $(2n+1)$-dimensional Lie algebra with basis $\{\xi, X_1, \ldots, X_n, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\}$ and the Lie brackets given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\xi,X_1] &= -\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}X_2 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}Y_1, \quad [Y_i,Y_j] = 0, \quad i,j \neq 2,\\
[\xi,X_2] &= \frac{\alpha\beta}{2}X_1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}Y_2, \quad [X_1,Y_1] = -\beta X_2 + 2\xi,\\
[\xi,X_i] &= -\frac{\alpha^2}{2}Y_i, \quad i \geq 3, \quad [X_1,Y_i] = 0, \quad i \geq 2,\\
[\xi,Y_1] &= \frac{\beta^2}{2}X_1 - \frac{\alpha\beta}{2}Y_2, \quad [X_2,Y_1] = \beta X_1 - \alpha Y_2,\\
[\xi,Y_2] &= \frac{\beta^2}{2}X_2 + \frac{\alpha\beta}{2}Y_1, \quad [X_2,Y_2] = \alpha Y_1 + 2\xi,\\
[\xi,Y_i] &= \frac{\beta^2}{2}X_i, \quad i \geq 3, \quad [X_2,Y_i] = \beta X_i, \quad i \geq 3,\\
[X_1,X_i] &= \alpha X_i, \quad i \neq 1, \quad [X_i,Y_1] = -\alpha Y_i, \quad i \geq 3,\\
[X_i,X_j] &= 0, \quad i,j \neq 1, \quad [X_i,Y_2] = 0, \quad i \geq 3,\\
[Y_2,Y_i] &= \beta Y_i, \quad i \neq 2, \quad [X_i,Y_j] = \delta_{ij}(-\beta X_2 + \alpha Y_1 + 2\xi), \quad i,j \geq 3,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.10}
$$

for real numbers $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Next we define a left-invariant contact metric structure $(\varphi,\xi,\eta,g)$ on the associated Lie group $G$ as follows:

- the basis $\{\xi, X_1, \ldots, X_n, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\}$ is orthogonal,
- the characteristic vector field is given by $\xi$,
- the one-form $\eta$ is the metric dual of $\xi$,
- the $(1,1)$-tensor field $\varphi$ is determined by $\varphi\xi = 0,\ \varphi X_i = Y_i,\ \varphi Y_i = -X_i$.

It can also be proved that $G$ is a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space with

$$\kappa = 1 - \frac{(\beta^2-\alpha^2)^2}{16},\ \mu = 2 + \frac{\alpha^2+\beta^2}{2}.$$

Moreover, supposing $\beta^2 > \alpha^2$ gives us that $\lambda = \frac{\beta^2-\alpha^2}{2} \neq 0$ and thus the $(\kappa,\mu)$-space is not Sasakian. The orthonormal basis also satisfies that $hX_i = \lambda X_i$ and $hY_i = -\lambda Y_i$.

Finally, $I_G = -\frac{\beta^2+\alpha^2}{\beta^2-\alpha^2} \leq -1$, so for the appropriate choice of $\beta > \alpha \geq 0$, $I_G$ attains any real value smaller than or equal to $-1$.

Lastly, we will recall some formulas from submanifolds theory in order to fix our notation. Let $N$ be an $n$-dimensional submanifold isometrically immersed in an $m$-dimensional Riemannian manifold $(M, g)$. Then, the Gauss and Weingarten formulas hold:

$$\nabla_X Y = \overline{\nabla}_X Y + \sigma(X, Y), \tag{2.11}$$

$$\nabla_X V = -A_V X + \nabla^\perp_X V, \tag{2.12}$$

for any tangent vector fields $X, Y$ and any normal vector field $V$. Here $\sigma$ denotes the *second fundamental form*, $A$ the *shape operator* and $\nabla^\perp$ the *normal connection*. It is well known that the second fundamental form and the shape operator are related the following way:

$$g(\sigma(X, Y), V) = g(A_V X, Y). \tag{2.13}$$

We denote by $R$ and $\overline{R}$ the curvature tensors of $M$ and $N$, respectively. They are related by Gauss and Codazzi's equations

$$R(X, Y, Z, W) = \overline{R}(X, Y, Z, W) - g(\sigma(X, W), \sigma(Y, Z)) + g(\sigma(X, Z), \sigma(Y, W)), \tag{2.14}$$

$$(R(X, Y)Z)^\perp = (\nabla_X \sigma)(Y, Z) - (\nabla_Y \sigma)(X, Z), \tag{2.15}$$

respectively, where $R(X, Y)Z^\perp$ denotes the normal component of $R(X, Y)Z$ and

$$(\nabla_X \sigma)(Y, Z) = \nabla^\perp_X(\sigma(Y, Z)) - \sigma(\overline{\nabla}_X Y, Z) - \sigma(Y, \overline{\nabla}_X Z). \tag{2.16}$$

The submanifold $N$ is said to be *totally geodesic* if the second fundamental form $\sigma$ vanishes identically. It is said that it is *totally umbilical* if there exists a normal vector field $V$ such that $\sigma(X, Y) = g(X, Y)V$, for any tangent vector fields $X, Y$. In fact, it can be proved that, in such a case, $V$ has to be the *mean curvature* $\widetilde{H} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma(e_i, e_i)$, where $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ is a local orthonormal frame. It is clear that every totally geodesic submanifold is also totally umbilical but the converse is not true in general.

## 3. Decomposition of the $h$ operator

Let $N$ be a Legendrian submanifold of a $(2n + 1)$-dimensional $(\kappa, \mu)$-space $M$, that is, an $n$-dimensional submanifold such that $\xi$ is normal to $N$. Therefore, $\eta(X) = 0$ for any tangent vector field $X$ and so it follows from (2.1) that $\varphi^2 X = -X$. Moreover, it was proved in [6] that $N$ is an anti-invariant submanifold, i.e., $\varphi X$ is normal for any tangent vector field $X$. Moreover, under our assumptions about the dimensions of $M$ and $N$, it holds that every normal vector field $V$ can be written as $\varphi X$, for a certain tangent vector field $X$.

Therefore, we can decompose the $h$ operator in the following way:

$$hX = h_1 X + \varphi h_2 X, \tag{3.1}$$

for any tangent vector field $X$, where $h_1 X$ (respectively $\varphi h_2 X$) denotes the tangent (resp. normal) component of $hX$.

We can prove the following properties:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let $N$ be a Legendrian submanifold of a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space $M$. Then, $h_1$ and $h_2$ are symmetric operators that satisfy $h_1\xi = h_2\xi = 0$ and equations*

$$h_1^2 + h_2^2 = (1-\kappa)I, \tag{3.2}$$

$$h_1h_2 = h_2h_1. \tag{3.3}$$

*Proof.* The symmetry of $h_1$ and $h_2$ can be directly obtained from that of $h$ and the compatibility of the metric $g$. Similarly, $h\xi = 0$ implies $h_1\xi = h_2\xi = 0$.

Furthermore, given a tangent vector field $X$, it follows from (2.1), (3.1) and the anticommutativity of $h$ and $\varphi$ that

$$h\varphi X = -\varphi hX = -\varphi h_1X + h_2X. \tag{3.4}$$

Using (2.4), we have that $h^2X = (1-\kappa)X$. On the other hand, by virtue of (3.1) and (3.4), we obtain

$$h^2X = h(h_1X + \varphi h_2X) = h_1^2X + \varphi h_2h_1X - \varphi h_1h_2X + h_2^2X.$$

Joining both expressions for $h^2$ and identifying the tangent and normal parts give us equations (3.2) and (3.3). □

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let $N$ be a Legendrian submanifold of a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space $M$. Then, $h_1$ and $h_2$ satisfy*

$$(\overline{\nabla}_Xh_1)Y = -\varphi\sigma(X,h_2Y) - h_2\varphi\sigma(X,Y), \tag{3.5}$$

$$(\overline{\nabla}_Xh_2)Y = \quad \varphi\sigma(X,h_1Y) + h_1\varphi\sigma(X,Y), \tag{3.6}$$

*for any tangent vector fields $X, Y$.*

*Proof.* It follows from Gauss and Weingarten formulas (2.11) and (2.12) that

$$(\nabla_X\varphi)Y = \nabla_X\varphi Y - \varphi\nabla_XY = -A_{\varphi Y}X + \nabla^\perp_X\varphi Y - \varphi\overline{\nabla}_XY - \varphi\sigma(X,Y),$$

for any tangent vector fields $X, Y$. Therefore, by using (2.5) and identifying the tangent and normal components, we obtain:

$$A_{\varphi Y}X = -\varphi\sigma(X,Y), \tag{3.7}$$

$$\nabla^\perp_X\varphi Y = \varphi\overline{\nabla}_XY + g(X,Y+h_1Y)\xi. \tag{3.8}$$

On the other hand, using (2.6) and (3.1), we have

$$\nabla_X(h_1Y + \varphi h_2Y) - h(\nabla_XY) = g(X,h_2Y)\xi,$$

from where, by virtue of Gauss and Weingarten formulas (2.11) and (2.12), we deduce

$$\overline{\nabla}_Xh_1Y + \sigma(X,h_1Y) - A_{\varphi h_2Y}X + \nabla^\perp_X\varphi h_2Y - h\overline{\nabla}_XY - h\sigma(X,Y) = g(X,h_2Y)\xi. \tag{3.9}$$

We can put $h\overline{\nabla}_XY = h_1\overline{\nabla}_XY + \varphi h_2\overline{\nabla}_XY$ by (3.1). Now, by using (2.1), we can write $\sigma(X,Y) = -\varphi^2\sigma(X,Y) + \eta(\sigma(X,Y))\xi$, and hence $h\sigma(X,Y) = -h\varphi^2\sigma(X,Y) = \varphi h\varphi\sigma(X,Y)$. Again, equation (3.1) gives us $h\sigma(X,Y) = \varphi h_1\varphi\sigma(X,Y) - h_2\varphi\sigma(X,Y)$. Therefore, if we substitute these two expressions, together with (3.7) and (3.8), in (3.9), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\nabla}_Xh_1Y + \sigma(X,h_1Y) + \varphi\sigma(X,h_2Y) + \varphi\overline{\nabla}_Xh_2Y + g(X,h_2Y+h_1h_2Y)\xi\\ -h_1\overline{\nabla}_XY - \varphi h_2\overline{\nabla}_XY - \varphi h_1\varphi\sigma(X,Y) + h_2\varphi\sigma(X,Y) = g(X,h_2Y)\xi.\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

By identifying the tangent and normal parts of (3.10), equations (3.5) and (3.6) hold. □

It is clear that, if we multiply (3.10) by $\xi$, then we obtain

$$g(\sigma(X,h_1Y),\xi)+g(X,h_1h_2Y)=0,$$

for any tangent vector fields $X,Y$. In fact, we can prove a more general result, which will be very useful in the proof of our main theorems:

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let $N$ be a Legendrian submanifold of a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space $M$. Then,*

$$g(\sigma(X,Y),\xi)+g(X,h_2Y)=0, \tag{3.11}$$

*for any tangent vector fields $X,Y$.*

*Proof.* It follows from Weingarten equation (2.12) and from (2.13) that

$$g(X,\nabla_X\xi)+g(\sigma(X,Y),\xi)=0,$$

for any tangent vector fields $X,Y$. Then, it is enough to use (2.1), (2.2) and (3.1) to obtain (3.11). □

## 4. Examples

We will present in this section some examples of totally geodesic and totally umbilical Legendrian submanifolds of the $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces of Example 2.2. Let us begin with the totally geodesic ones.

*Example* 4.1. Let $M$ be a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space from Example 2.2 with invariant $I_M\leq -1$. Then, the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ spanned by $\{X_1,\ldots,X_n\}$ is involutive and any integral submanifold $N$ of it is a totally geodesic submanifold of $M$. Indeed, the involutive condition can be easily checked from (2.10). In order to prove the totally geodesic one, it is enough to show that $\nabla_{X_i}X_j\in\mathcal{D}$, for any $i,j=1,\ldots,n$, where $\nabla$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection on $M$. In fact, in can be directly computed that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{X_1}X_1=\nabla_{X_1}X_2=0,\quad \nabla_{X_2}X_1=-\alpha X_2,\quad \nabla_{X_2}X_2=\alpha X_1,\\
&\nabla_{X_1}X_i=\nabla_{X_2}X_i=0,\ \text{for any } i=3,\ldots,n,\\
&\nabla_{X_i}X_1=-\alpha X_i,\quad \nabla_{X_i}X_2=0,\quad \nabla_{X_i}X_j=\delta_{ij}\alpha X_1,\ \text{for any } i,j=3,\ldots,n.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, since $hX_i=\lambda X_i$ for any $i=1,\ldots,n$, then $TN=E(\lambda)$.

*Example* 4.2. Let $M$ be a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space from Example 2.2 with invariant $I_M\leq -1$. Then, the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ spanned by $\{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\}$ is also involutive and any integral submanifold $N$ of it is a totally geodesic submanifold of $M$. Indeed, both conditions can be checked the same way as in Example 4.1, by taking now into account that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{Y_1}Y_1=\beta Y_2,\quad \nabla_{Y_1}Y_2=-\beta Y_1,\quad \nabla_{Y_2}Y_1=\nabla_{Y_2}Y_2=0,\\
&\nabla_{Y_1}Y_i=\nabla_{Y_2}Y_i=0,\ \text{for any } i=3,\ldots,n,\\
&\nabla_{Y_i}Y_1=0,\quad \nabla_{Y_i}Y_2=-\beta Y_i,\quad \nabla_{Y_i}Y_j=\delta_{ij}\beta Y_2,\ \text{for any } i,j=3,\ldots,n.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

In this case, since $hY_i=-\lambda Y_i$ for any $i=1,\ldots,n$, then $TN=E(-\lambda)$.

*Example* 4.3. Let $M$ be a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space from Example 2.2 with invariant $I_M \leq -1$. Then, the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ spanned by $\{X_1, Y_2, Z_3, \ldots, Z_n\}$, where $Z_i$ is either $X_i$ or $Y_i$, for any $i = 3, \ldots, n$, is also involutive and any integral submanifold $N$ of it is a totally geodesic submanifold of $M$. Indeed, both conditions can be checked the same way as in Examples 4.1 and 4.2, by using now (4.1), (4.2) and the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_{X_1} Y_i = 0 \text{ for any } i = 2, \ldots, n,\\ &\nabla_{Y_2} X_i = 0 \text{ for any } i = 1, 3, \ldots, n,\\ &\nabla_{X_i} Y_2 = \nabla_{Y_i} X_1 = 0 \text{ for any } i = 3, \ldots, n,\\ &\nabla_{X_i} Y_j = \nabla_{Y_i} X_j = 0 \text{ for any } i, j = 3, \ldots, n, \text{ such that } i \neq j. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Finally, $TN = E(\lambda) \oplus E(-\lambda)$, with $\dim E(\lambda) = k$ (respectively $\dim E(-\lambda) = n-k$), where $k-1$ (resp. $n-k-1$) is the number of $Z_i$ such that $Z_i = X_i$ (resp. $Z_i = Y_i$). Therefore, we can obtain an example for any value of $k$ from 1 to $n-1$.

We now present the family of totally umbilical examples:

*Example* 4.4. Let $M$ be a $(\kappa,\mu)$-space from Example 2.2 with invariant $I_M \leq -1$. Then, the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ spanned by $\{cX_1 + dY_1, \ldots, cX_n + dY_n\}$, with $c, d$ non-zero constants, is involutive and any integral submanifold $N$ of it is a totally umbilical submanifold of $M$. Indeed, the involutive condition can be easily checked from (2.10). In order to prove the totally umbilical one, we will first show that $\sigma(cX_i + dY_i, cX_j + dY_j) = 2\delta_{ij} cd\lambda\xi$ by checking that the Levi-Civita connection on $M$ satisfies $\nabla_{cX_i+dY_i}(cX_j + dY_j) = Z + 2\delta_{ij} cd\lambda\xi$, with $Z \in \mathcal{D}$, for any $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$. In fact, it can be directly computed that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_{cX_1+dY_1}(cX_1 + dY_1) = \beta d(cX_2 + dY_2) + 2cd\lambda\xi, \quad \nabla_{cX_1+dY_1}(cX_2 + dY_2) = -\beta d(cX_1 + dY_1),\\ &\nabla_{cX_2+dY_2}(cX_1 + dY_1) = -\alpha c(cX_2 + dY_2), \quad \nabla_{cX_2+dY_2}(cX_2 + dY_2) = \alpha c(cX_1 + dY_1) + 2cd\lambda\xi,\\ &\nabla_{cX_1+dY_1}(cX_j + dY_j) = \nabla_{cX_2+dY_2}(cX_j + dY_j) = 0, \text{ for any } j = 3, \ldots, n,\\ &\nabla_{cX_i+dY_i}(cX_1 + dY_1) = -\alpha c(cX_i + dY_i),\\ &\nabla_{cX_i+dY_i}(cX_2 + dY_2) = -\beta d(cX_i + dY_i), \text{ for any } i = 3, \ldots, n,\\ &\nabla_{cX_i+dY_i}(cX_j + dY_j) = \delta_{ij}(\alpha c(cX_1 + dY_1) + \beta d(cX_2 + dY_2) + 2cd\lambda\xi), \text{ for any } i, j = 3, \ldots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can write $\sigma(cX_i + dY_i, cX_j + dY_j) = g(cX_i + dY_i, cX_j + dY_j)\frac{2cd\lambda}{c^2+d^2}\xi$ and, since $\frac{2cd\lambda}{c^2+d^2}\xi \neq 0$, the submanifold is totally umbilical but not totally geodesic.

Finally, we observe that $cX_i + dY_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, is not an eigenvector of $h$.

## 5. Main results

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let $N$ be a Legendrian submanifold of a $(2n+1)$-dimensional $(\kappa,\mu)$-space $M$, with $\kappa < 1$ and $I_M \leq -1$. If $N$ is totally geodesic, then, up to local isometries, it must be one of the submanifolds given in Examples 4.1, 4.2 or 4.3.*

*Proof.* Since the submanifold $N$ is totally geodesic, if follows directly from (3.11) that $h_2 = 0$ and so $h = h_1$ and $h_1^2 = (1-\kappa)I$ (see (3.1) and (3.2)). By using the decomposition given by Theorem 2.1, we can write

$$TN = E(\lambda) \oplus E(-\lambda), \tag{5.1}$$

where $\dim(E(\lambda)) = k$ and $\dim(E(-\lambda)) = n-k$, for a certain $k \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$.

Moreover, we deduce from (3.5) that $\overline{\nabla} h_1 = 0$. Therefore, it is straightforward to check that, if $Y_\lambda \in E(\lambda)$, then $\overline{\nabla}_X Y_\lambda \in E(\lambda)$, for every tangent vector field $X$. Similarly, if $Y_{-\lambda} \in E(-\lambda)$, then $\overline{\nabla}_X Y_{-\lambda} \in E(-\lambda)$. Thus, $E(\lambda)$ and $E(-\lambda)$ are parallel and hence involutive. By virtue of Theorem 5.4 of [5], $N$ can be locally decomposed as $M_1 \times M_2$, where $M_1$ and $M_2$ are leaves of the distributions $E(\lambda)$ and $E(-\lambda)$, respectively. Furthermore, it follows from (2.7) that, if $\dim M_1 \geq 2$ (resp. $\dim M_2 \geq 2$), then $M_1$ (resp. $M_2$) has constant curvature $2(1+\lambda) - \mu = 2\lambda(I_M + 1) \leq 0$ (resp. $2(1-\lambda) - \mu = 2\lambda(I_M - 1) < 0$).

Recall that we have examples of submanifolds with decomposition (5.1) for every value of $k$. Indeed, see Example 4.1 for $k = n$, Example 4.2 for $k = 0$ and Example 4.3 for any value of $k$ from 1 to $n-1$. Now, we will prove that any example must be one of these, up to local isometries.

Let us denote by $F : N^n \to M^{2n+1}(\kappa,\mu)$ the immersion of $N$ into $M$. Since $\kappa < 1$ and $I_M \leq -1$, we can suppose that, locally, $M^{2n+1}(\kappa,\mu)$ is one of the Lie groups from Example 2.2. Thus, it is homogeneous and we can fix a point $p_0 \in N$ such that $F(p_0) = e$, where $e$ is the neutral element of the group.

We will give the explicit details when $2 \leq k \leq n-2$. The other cases can be done in a similar way. We have that $N = M_1(2\lambda(I_M+1)) \times M_2(2\lambda(I_M-1))$ and we also identify $N$ with its image as the (totally geodesic) integral submanifold through $e$ of the distribution spanned by $X_1, X_3, \ldots, X_{k+1}, Y_2, Y_{k+2}, \ldots Y_n$. We denote by $G$ the latter immersion of $N$ and we pick an orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ at the point $p_0$ of $N$, with $G(p_0) = e$, such that $E_{p_0}(\lambda) = \langle e_1(p_0), \ldots, e_k(p_0)\rangle$, $E_{p_0}(-\lambda) = \langle e_{k+1}(p_0), \ldots, e_n(p_0)\rangle$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&dG(e_1(p_0)) = X_1(e),\\
&dG(e_j(p_0)) = X_{j+1}(e), \quad j = 2, \ldots, k,\\
&dG(e_{k+1}(p_0)) = Y_2(e),\\
&dG(e_j(p_0)) = Y_j(e), \quad j = k+2, \ldots, n,
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by construction both

$$X_1(e), X_3(e), \ldots, X_{k+1}(e), \varphi Y_2(e), \varphi Y_{k+2}(e), \ldots, \varphi Y_n(e)$$

and

$$dF(e_1(p_0)), \ldots, dF(e_k(p_0)), \varphi dF(e_{k+1}(p_0)), \ldots, \varphi dF(e_n(p_0))$$

are basis of $E_e(\lambda)$. So, in view of Theorem 3 of [3], there exists an isometry $H$ of $M^{2n+1}(\kappa,\mu)$ preserving the structure such that $H(e) = e$ and $H$ maps one basis of $E_e(\lambda)$ into the other one. As a consequence, we have that $H \circ F(e) = G(e)$ and $d(H \circ F)(e_i) = dG(e_i)$.

We now take a geodesic $\gamma$ in $N$ through the point $p_0$. Since $N$ is totally geodesic, both with respect to the immersions $H \circ F$ and $G$, the curves $H \circ F(\gamma)$ and $G(\gamma)$ are both geodesics in $M^{2n+1}(\kappa,\mu)$ through $e$. Since $d(H \circ F)(e_i) = dG(e_i)$, they are also determined by the same initial conditions. Therefore, both curves need to coincide, so $H \circ F(\gamma(s)) = G(\gamma(s))$ for all $s$ and thus $F$ and $G$ are congruent. □

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let $N$ be a Legendrian submanifold of a $(2n+1)$-dimensional $(\kappa,\mu)$-space $M$, with $n \geq 3$, $\kappa < 1$ and $I_M \leq -1$. If $N$ is totally umbilical (but not totally geodesic), then, up to local isometries, it must be one of the submanifolds given in Example 4.4.*

*Proof.* Since $N$ is totally umbilical (but not totally geodesic), then there exists a normal vector field $V \neq 0$ such that $\sigma(X,Y) = g(X,Y)V$. It follows from (3.11) that $g(X,Y)\eta(V) + g(X,h_2Y) = 0$, for any tangent vector fields $X, Y$, and thus

$$h_2Y = aY, \tag{5.2}$$

with $a = -\eta(V)$.

We will now prove that $a \neq 0$. Indeed, if we suppose that $a = 0$, then $h_2 = 0$ and, as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we have that $h = h_1$, $h_1^2 = (1-\kappa)I$ and $\overline{\nabla}h_1 = 0$. Moreover, since $h_2 = 0$, it is clear that $\overline{\nabla}h_2 = 0$ and we obtain from (3.6) that $\varphi\sigma(X,h_1Y) + h_1\varphi\sigma(X,Y) = 0$, which, by using that $N$ is totally umbilical, becomes

$$g(X,h_1Y)\varphi V + g(X,Y)h_1\varphi V = 0, \tag{5.3}$$

for any tangent vector fields $X, Y$. Let us now choose unit vector fields $X_\lambda \in E(\lambda)$ and $X_{-\lambda} \in E(-\lambda)$. Then, taking $X = Y = X_\lambda$ in (5.3) implies $h_1\varphi V = -\lambda\varphi V$ and taking $X = Y = X_{-\lambda}$ in (5.3) implies $h_1\varphi V = \lambda\varphi V$. Since $V \neq 0$, this yields a contradiction.

Therefore, we can suppose from now on that (5.2) holds for $a \neq 0$. We deduce from equation (3.6) that

$$X(a)Y = \varphi\sigma(X,h_1Y) + h_1\varphi\sigma(X,Y) = g(X,h_1Y)\varphi V + g(X,Y)h_1\varphi V,$$

for every $X, Y$ tangent vector fields.

Since $\dim N \geq 3$, we can take $Y$ linearly independent from $\varphi V$ and $h_1\varphi V$. Then we deduce from the previous equation that $X(a) = 0$, for every $X$, thus $a$ is a constant. Moreover, $g(X,h_1Y)\varphi V + g(X,Y)h_1\varphi V = 0$, for every $X, Y$ tangent vector fields. Taking unit $X = Y$, we obtain that $h_1\varphi V = -g(X,h_1X)\varphi V$, which is only possible if $h_1 = 0$ or $\varphi V = 0$. If $h_1 = 0$, then substituting (5.2) in (3.6) gives that $2ag(X,Y)\varphi V = 0$, so again $\varphi V = 0$.

In both cases, we have obtained that $\varphi V = 0$, so $V$ is parallel to $\xi$ and it follows from $a = -\eta(V)$ that $V = -a\xi$ and $\sigma(X,Y) = -ag(X,Y)\xi$ holds, for every $X, Y$ tangent, where $a \neq 0$ is a constant.

Let us now recall Codazzi's equation (2.15):

$$(R(X,Y)Z)^\perp = (\nabla_X\sigma)(Y,Z) - (\nabla_Y\sigma)(X,Z).$$

The first term is the normal component of $R(X,Y)Z$, so by equation (2.9) and the fact that $h_2X = h_1X + a\varphi X$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}(R(X,Y)Z)^\perp &= a(g(Y,Z)\varphi X - g(X,Z)\varphi Y)\\ &\quad + a\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}(g(h_1Y,Z)\varphi X - g(h_1X,Z)\varphi Y)\\ &\quad - a\frac{\kappa-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}(g(Y,Z)\varphi h_1X - g(X,Z)\varphi h_1Y).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_X\sigma)(Y,Z) &= \nabla^\perp_X(\sigma(Y,Z)) - \sigma(\overline{\nabla}_XY,Z) - \sigma(Y,\overline{\nabla}_XZ) =\\ &= \nabla^\perp_X(-ag(Y,Z)\xi) + ag(\overline{\nabla}_XY,Z)\xi + ag(\overline{\nabla}_XZ,X)\xi =\\ &= -ag(Y,Z)\overline{\nabla}^\perp_X\xi = ag(Y,Z)(\varphi X + \varphi h_1X).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the second term of Codazzi's equation is

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_X\sigma)(Y,Z)-(\nabla_Y\sigma)(X,Z) &= ag(Y,Z)(\varphi X+\varphi h_1X)-ag(X,Z)(\varphi Y+\varphi h_1Y)\\ &= a(g(Y,Z)\varphi X-g(X,Z)\varphi Y)+a(g(Y,Z)\varphi h_1X-g(X,Z)\varphi h_1Y).\end{aligned}$$

Joining both terms, and bearing in mind that $a\neq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}(g(h_1Y,Z)\varphi X-g(h_1X,Z)\varphi Y)=\\ &=\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}(g(Y,Z)\varphi h_1X-g(X,Z)\varphi h_1Y).\end{aligned}$$

Since we are supposing that $I_M=\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{\sqrt{1-\kappa}}\leq -1$, then $\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}\neq 0$ and applying $\varphi$ to both terms of the previous equation gives us that

$$g(h_1Y,Z)X-g(h_1X,Z)Y=g(Y,Z)h_1X-g(X,Z)h_1Y,$$

for every $X,Y,Z$ tangent vector fields.

Since $\dim(N)\geq 3$, we can choose $Y=Z$ unit and orthogonal to $X,h_1X$, and we obtain that

$$h_1X=g(h_1Y,Y)X, \tag{5.4}$$

and thus $h_1X=bX$ for some function $b$.

From (3.2), we have that $a^2+b^2=1-\kappa=\lambda^2\neq 0$, and in particular that $b$ must be constant. We can also write that $a=\lambda\cos(\theta)$ and $b=\lambda\sin(\theta)$ for some constant $\theta\in[-\pi,\pi]$. Since $a\neq 0$, then $\theta\neq\pm\frac{\pi}{2}$.

By Gauss equation (2.14) and the fact that $h_2X=aX$, then

$$\begin{aligned}R(X,Y,Z,W) &= \overline{R}(X,Y,Z,W)-g(\sigma(X,W),\sigma(Y,Z))+g(\sigma(X,Z),\sigma(Y,W))=\\ &= \overline{R}(X,Y,Z,W)-a^2(g(X,W)g(Y,Z)+g(X,Z)g(Y,W)),\end{aligned}$$

for every $X,Y,Z,W$ tangent vector fields.

On the other hand, we know from equation (2.9) and the fact that $hX=bX+a\varphi X$, that

$$R(X,Y,Z,W)=\left(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+2b+b^2\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}+a^2\frac{\kappa-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}\right)(g(X,W)g(Y,Z)-g(X,Z)g(Y,W)).$$

Joining the last two equations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{R}(X,Y,Z,W) &= \left(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+2b+b^2\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}+a^2\left(\frac{\kappa-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}+1\right)\right)(g(X,W)g(Y,Z)-g(X,Z)g(Y,W))\\ &= \left(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+2b+(a^2+b^2)\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{1-\kappa}\right)(g(X,W)g(Y,Z)-g(X,Z)g(Y,W))\\ &= 2(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+b)(g(X,W)g(Y,Z)-g(X,Z)g(Y,W)).\end{aligned}$$

This means that the submanifold is a space form with constant curvature $2(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+b)$. Moreover, since $I_M=\frac{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}{\sqrt{1-\kappa}}\leq -1$ and $b=\lambda\sin(\theta)\neq\lambda$, then $1-\frac{\mu}{2}+b<1-\frac{\mu}{2}+\lambda\leq 0$ and the submanifold is a hyperbolic space $N=\mathbb{H}(2(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+\lambda\sin(\theta)))$.

Summing up, there exists $\theta \in [-\pi, \pi]$, $\theta \neq \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \mathbb{H}(2(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+\lambda\sin(\theta))),\\ h_1X &= \lambda\sin(\theta)X,\\ h_2X &= \lambda\cos(\theta)X,\\ \sigma(X,Y) &= -\lambda\cos(\theta)g(X,Y)\xi. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

We have examples of submanifolds with these properties for every value of $\theta$. Indeed, Examples 4.4 with $c = \cos(\pi/4 - \theta/2)$, $d = -\sin(\pi/4 - \theta/2)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(cX_i + dY_i, cX_j + dY_j) = 2\delta_{ij}cd\lambda\xi = -2\delta_{ij}\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\lambda\xi =\\ = -\delta_{ij}\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\theta\right)\lambda\xi = -\delta_{ij}\lambda\cos(\theta)\xi =\\ = -\lambda\cos(\theta)g(cX_i + dY_i, cX_j + dY_j)\xi, \end{aligned}$$

and the rest of conditions also hold.

Now, we will prove that any totally umbilical submanifold $N$ must be one of these, up to local isometries. Let us denote by $F : N^n \to M^{2n+1}(\kappa,\mu)$ the immersion of $N$ into $M(\kappa,\mu)$. Since $\kappa < 1$ and $I_M \leq -1$, we can suppose that, locally, $M(\kappa,\mu)$ is one of the Lie groups from Example 2.2. Thus, it is homogeneous and we can fix a point $p_0 \in N$ such that $F(p_0) = e$, where $e$ is the neutral element of the group.

We have that $N = \mathbb{H}(2(1-\frac{\mu}{2}+\lambda\sin(\theta)))$ and we can identify $N$ with its image as the (totally umbilical) integral submanifold through $e$ of the distribution spanned by $\{cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)X_i(e) - \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)Y_i(e), i = 1,\dots,n\}$. We denote by $G$ this immersion of $N$ and we take an orthonormal basis $\{e_1,\dots,e_n\}$ at the point $p_0$ of $N$ such that

$$dG(e_i) = cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)X_i(e) - \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)Y_i(e),\ i = 1,\dots,n.$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$h(dF(e_i)) = dF(\lambda\sin(\theta)e_i) + \varphi dF(\lambda\cos(\theta)e_i) = \lambda\sin(\theta)dF(e_i) + \lambda\cos(\theta)\varphi dF(e_i), \tag{5.6}$$

$$h\varphi(dF(e_i)) = -\varphi h(dF(e_i)) = \lambda\cos(\theta)dF(e_i) - \lambda\sin(\theta)\varphi dF(e_i). \tag{5.7}$$

Therefore, using (5.6) and (5.7), we can construct eigenvectors of $h$ associated with the eigenvalue $\lambda$ the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
&h\left(cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)dF(e_i)+\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\varphi(dF(e_i))\right)=\\
&=\lambda\left(\left(cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\sin(\theta)+\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\cos(\theta)\right)dF(e_i)\right.\\
&\quad\left.+\left(cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\cos(\theta)-\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\sin(\theta)\right)\varphi(dF(e_i))\right)=\\
&=\lambda\left(\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}+\frac{\theta}{2}\right)dF(e_i)+\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}+\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\varphi(dF(e_i))\right)=\\
&=\lambda\left(cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)dF(e_i)+\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\varphi(dF(e_i))\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for any $i=1,\dots,n$.

Note that, by construction, both

$$\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)dF(e_i)+\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\varphi(dF(e_i)),\ i=1,\dots,n$$

and

$$X_1(e),\dots,X_n(e)$$

are basis of $E_e(\lambda)$. So, in view of Theorem 3 of [3], there exists an isometry $H$ of $M^{2n+1}(\kappa,\mu)$ preserving the structure such that $H(e)=e$ and $H$ maps one basis of $E_e(\lambda)$ into the other one. As a consequence, we have that $H\circ F(e)=G(e)$ and $d(H\circ F)(e_i)=dG(e_i)$.

We now take a geodesic $\gamma$ in $N$ through the point $p_0$. Since $N$ is totally umbilical with respect to both $H\circ F$ and $G$, then $\gamma_1=H\circ F(\gamma)$ and $\gamma_2=G(\gamma)$ are curves in $M(\kappa,\mu)$ passing through $e$ that satisfy $\nabla_{\gamma_1'}\gamma_1'=\nabla_{\gamma_2'}\gamma_2'=-\lambda\sin(\theta)\xi$. Since $d(H\circ F)(e_i)=dG(e_i)$, they are also determined by the same initial conditions. Therefore, both curves need to coincide, so $H\circ F(\gamma(s))=G(\gamma(s))$ for all $s$ and thus $F$ and $G$ are congruent. □

## References


[1] D. E. Blair. *Riemannian Geometry of Contact and Symplectic Manifolds*, Second Edition. Progress in Mathematics **203**. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2010.

[2] D. E. Blair, T. Koufogiorgos and B. J. Papantoniou. Contact metric manifolds satisfying a nullity condition. *Israel J. Math.* **91** (1995), 189–214.

[3] E. Boeckx. A full classification of contact metric $(\kappa,\mu)$-spaces. *Illinois J. Math.* **44** (2000), 212–219.

[4] B. Cappelletti Montano, L. Di Terlizzi and M. M. Tripathi. Invariant submanifolds of contact $(\kappa,\mu)$-manifolds. *Glasgow Math. J.* **50** (2008), 499–507.

[5] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu. *Foundations of Differential Geometry*. Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics **15**, Volume I. Interscience, New York, 1963.

[6] A. Lotta. Slant submanifolds in contact geometry. *Bull. Math. Soc. Roumanie* **39** (1996), 183–198.

Departamento de Geometría y Topología, c/ Tarfia s/n, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla 41012, Spain
*E-mail address*: carriazo@us.es

Departamento de Didáctica de las Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación, c/ Pirotecnia s/n, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla 41013, Spain
*E-mail address*: veronicamartin@us.es

LAMAV, Université de Valenciennes, 59313, Valenciennes Cedex 9, France and Departement Wiskunde, KU Leuven, Celestijnenlaan 200 B, 3001, Leuven, Belgium
*E-mail address*: luc.vrancken@univ-valenciennes.fr